

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

### Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-6, 8-13 and 15-20 are rejected, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being allegedly unpatentable over Iwata et al. (US Patent No. 6,009,338) (hereinafter Iwata) in view of Eromaki Marko et al., (EP 1 051 012 A2) (hereinafter Marko). Applicants respectfully traverse in view of the following.

Independent Claim 1 recites a sliding component operable to change the size of a dimension of the portable electronic device, e.g., length, by sliding relative to said processor module, as claimed. Thus, the size of the electronic device may be contracted or expanded. Independent Claim 1 further recites that the sliding component is operable to accept at least one button input from a user, as claimed. Moreover, independent Claim 1 recites that a device driver performs an action based on a selection of information displayed on the display, wherein the selection is based on the position of said edge relative to said displayed information, as claimed. Accordingly, an action is performed based on making a selection of information displayed that is based on the location of the edge of the sliding component. For example, the edge of the sliding component can select an action to “call Peter” when the edge of the sliding component is under the “call Peter” item that is being displayed.

In contrast, Iwata discloses a slide cover that moves relative to the body of the electronic device (see Iwata, Figure 51, elements 301 and 302). Movement of the slide cover relative to the body covers various portions of the electronic device without changing the size and/or dimensions of the electronic device (see Iwata, Figures 51 and 52, elements 301, 302, 303, 312 and 313). For example, the slide cover does not extend beyond the body length of the device and similarly fails to shorten the size of the device. Iwata further discloses projections that maintain the slide cover within the body length of the electronic device (see Iwata, Figure 53, elements 301, 302, 314 and 315). As such, not only does Iwata fail to either teach or suggest a sliding component operable to change the size of a dimension of the portable electronic device, as claimed but Iwata teaches away by disclosing that the slide cover is contained within the body length of the device.

Furthermore, Iwata discloses a location detector for detecting a location of the slide cover (see Iwata, col. 5, lines 55-56). Iwata further discloses a display switch that changes the size of the display area for displaying information and a displaying direction of information according to the location of the slide cover detected by the location detector (see Iwata, col. 5, lines 56-59). Moving the slide cover changes the size of the display area based on the location of the slide cover, as disclosed by Iwata, independent from the content being displayed. For example, Iwata changes the size of the display area every time the slide cover

moves regardless of the content being displayed on the display. In other words, changing of display size area, as disclosed by Iwata, is not content sensitive. As such, Iwata fails to teach or suggest that the action is based on a selection of information displayed on the display, as claimed.

As presented and discussed above, changing of display size area, as disclosed by Iwata, is not content sensitive. As such, changing the display size area, according to Iwata, fails to teach or suggest selection based on the position of the edge relative to the displayed information, in the claimed fashion.

The rejection admits that Iwata fails to teach a sliding component operable to accept at least one button input from a user, as claimed. The rejection relies on Marko. Applicants respectfully submit that Marko fails to remedy the shortcomings of Iwata for failing to teach or suggest a sliding component operable to change the size of a dimension of the portable electronic device, as claimed. Moreover, Marko fails to teach or suggest a device driver performs an action based on a selection of information displayed on the display, wherein the selection is based on the position of said edge relative to said displayed information, as claimed. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Marko renders the intended purpose of Iwata inoperable in view of the following.

Marko discloses a keyboard that slides relative to the body of the device (see Marko, Figures 14 and 15, element KB2). The keyboard accepts user input. Use of a keyboard as a protective shield exposes the keyboard and electronics therein to damage, e.g., damage from dropping the device, etc. In contrast, Iwata discloses that the structure of a cover for protecting an input display unit for a portable electronic apparatus (see Iwata, col. 1, lines 17-20). Accordingly, the slider cover, as disclosed by Iwata serves as a protective shield for the electronic apparatus. As such, using the keyboard, as disclosed by Marko, as a protective shield, as disclosed by Iwata, exposes the keyboard and electronics therein to damages resulting from its use as a protective shield. Thus, using the keyboard of Marko to modify the sliding cover of Iwata renders the intended purpose of the protective shield of Iwata inoperable since it exposes the electronics within the keyboard to damages resulting from its use as a protective shield. Therefore, one would not be motivated to modify Iwata according to the teaching of Marko.

Accordingly, Iwata alone or in combination with Marko fails to render independent Claim 1 obvious, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Dependent claims are patentable by virtue of their dependency.

As per Claim 2, the rejection asserts that a display switch for changing the size of the display area is considered as the action for visual configuration. Applicants respectfully disagree. Resizing a display merely changes the size of

the display and does not necessarily configure visual data rendered on the display, as claimed. For example, changing the size may be by covering a portion of the display, thereby showing only a portion of the display without necessarily configuring any of the data being displayed. Thus, resizing the display, as disclosed by Iwata, does not necessarily teach or suggest visual configuration of data rendered on the display, as claimed.

As per Claims 3 and 4, Iwata discloses a telephone keyboard for dialing and an electronic note keyboard for character data input keys (see Iwata, col. 1, lines 36-42). Iwata further discloses that the telephone mode and electronic note mode are based on the output from a cover switch that detects open/close status of the cover (see Iwata, col. 1, lines 43-45). Open/close status of the cover, as disclosed by Iwata, differs from the action based on a selection of information displayed on the display, as claimed under similar rationale as presented and discussed above. Therefore, using the keyboard for dialing or electronic note keyboard for character data input keys based on the open/close position of the cover, as disclosed by Iwata, fails to teach or suggest that the action is based on a selection of information displayed on the display, wherein the action is an initiation of communication, in the claimed fashion.

Claims 8-10 recite limitations similar to that of Claims 1-3 and are patentable for similar reasons.

As per Claim 11, lwata discloses a first and a second software that share information for a telephone operation (see lwata, col. 7, lines 33-35). lwata further discloses a third piece of software that enables access to the shared information (see lwata, col. 7, lines 36-38). lwata discloses that the electronic device may be used as a telephone when the door is in a closed position (see lwata, col. 7, lines 39-43). Sharing of information between the first and the second software and obtaining access to the shared information using a third piece of software, as disclosed by lwata, fails to either teach or suggest a display of related additional information for the portion of the information, as claimed.

As per Claim 12, lwata discloses a switch that is used to detect the close/open position of the sliding cover (see lwata, col. 12, lines 48-53 and Figure 2). Detecting a close/open position of a sliding cover, as disclosed by lwata, fails to either teach or suggest selecting a portion of the information that is being displayed, as claimed. As such, lwata fails to teach or suggest that the selection is via a key, in the claimed fashion.

As per Claim 15, the rejection asserts that element SP1 of Marko is a speaker. Applicants respectfully disagree because Marko explicitly discloses that the mobile station comprises a push spring SP1 (see Marko, col. 7, line 24).

Thus, Marko fails to teach or suggest that the sliding cover further comprises a speaker, as claimed.

Claims 16-20 recite limitations similar to that of Claims 8-11 and are patentable for similar reasons.

Claim 7 is rejected, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being allegedly unpatentable over Iwata, Marko and in view of Uusimaki Matti (EP 1 107 101 A2) (hereinafter Matti). Applicants respectfully traverse in view of the following.

Claim 7 depends from independent Claim 1. Matti fails to teach or suggest the limitations of independent Claim 1. As such, Claim 7 is patentable over the combination of by virtue of its dependency. Claim 7 is further patentable in view of the following.

As presented and discussed above, the intended purpose for having a slide cover is its use as a protective shield, as disclosed by Iwata. Thus, modifying the teachings of Iwata such that the slide cover contains electronic components, e.g., input key, renders the intended purpose of the slide cover as a protective shield inoperable since the use of input key as a protective shield exposes the input key to damage therefrom. Accordingly, one would not be motivated to combine Matti with Iwata and Marko.

Claim 14 is rejected, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being allegedly unpatentable over Iwata in view of Marko, and further in view of Hansen et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,956,625) (hereinafter Hansen). Applicants respectfully traverse in view of the following.

Claim 14 depends from independent Claim 8. Hansen fails to teach or suggest the limitations of independent Claim 8. As such, Claim 14 is patentable over the combination of Iwata, Marko and Hansen by virtue of its dependency.

As presented and discussed above, the intended purpose for having a slide cover is its use as a protective shield, as disclosed by Iwata. Thus, modifying the teachings of Iwata such that the slide cover contain electronic components, e.g., microphone, renders the intended purpose of the slide cover as a protective shield inoperable since the use of microphone as a protective shield exposes the input key to damages therefrom. Accordingly, one would not be motivated to combine Hanson with Iwata and Marko.

As such, allowance of Claims 1-20 is earnestly solicited.

For the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103.



### CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks, reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested. Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-20 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, allowance of Claims 1-20 is earnestly solicited.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,  
MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 4/23/ , 2008

/Amir A. Tabarrok/  
Amir A. Tabarrok  
Registration No. 57,137

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP  
Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, California 95113

(408) 938-9060 Voice  
(408) 938-9069 Facsimile